

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 were previously cancelled. Claims 11-20 are pending and under consideration.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, at pages 1-3, claims 11-20 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Raghavan et al. ("A Reliability Output Viterbi Algorithm with Applications to Hybrid ARQ").

Raghavan et al. merely discloses a method in which a probability of whether a transmitted data packet contains errors is determined. This determined probability pertains to the data packet as a whole and a retransmission of the whole data packet is requested if the probability exceeds a certain threshold (Raghavan et al., p. 1216, col. 2).

In contrast, the invention of claim 11 does not check the error probabilities for fixed data packets, but instead takes into account a data stream. Unlike Raghavan et al., claim 1 provides that data packets are not completely discarded if a reliability value falls below a predetermined threshold, but can be partially discarded by discarding only the parts of the packet that do not meet the reliability criteria. Thereafter, these discarded parts are retransmitted in a newly formed packet that consists of the discarded parts and new, fresh parts of the data stream. These retransmitted parts are then transmitted on a more reliable position (for example, most significant bits and least significant bits) in order to assure low latency. As such, Raghavan et al. does not discuss or suggest:

dividing a transmission-end input data stream into individual words;

determining *a-priori* reliability values for positions of a transmittal data block based on transmission-end modulation methods and coding methods;

allocating the words of the input data stream and transmitting in corresponding positions of the transmittal data block based on the *a-priori* reliability values;

forming, at a receiving end, an *a-posteriori* reliability value for each word of the transmittal data block; and

re-requesting received words having a minimum value falling below the *a-posteriori* reliability value, and re-transmitting from the transmission end,

as recited in claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Raghavan et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-20 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 11, and include all the features of claim 11, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the reference relied upon. Therefore, claims 12-20 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 102(b) rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1-9-08

By: 

Aaron C. Walker
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501